Abstract

This paper presents a research project aiming at developing comparable quantitative data in the member states of the European Union on migrants’ and ethnic minorities’ experiences of racism and discrimination. This means that the project has on the one hand a method developing aim and on the other hand a data developing aim. By applying a quantitative methodology for sampling, data collection and data analysis that has been successfully practiced in Sweden the project tries to achieve the basis for comparability. However, the conditions for conducting quantitative surveys among random samples of migrants and ethnic minorities vary in the member states of the European Union. In the paper this is discussed. The Swedish model study is compared with the Dutch, the Italian, and the Spanish.

In spite of the various methods for samples, and data collection, the findings are quite similar. Survey data from all countries prove that a high number of all migrants studied have made experiences of discrimination and have been subjected to insults/harassment at work, school or university; subject to threats in other public places, refused jobs or entry to a pub/restaurant, subject to harassment by neighbours, badly treated by the police. Reporting to authorities are in general low. Gender can in these studies explain less about variation in perceived discrimination than ethnicity. However, men express to a higher extent having been victims of discrimination than women. Less gender differences are found in the public/social domain compared to the employment.
1. Introduction

Contemporary racism in Europe, hit at ethnic minorities and immigrant communities, at their norms and values. Contemporary racism tends to apply arguments that are couched in terms of cultural as well as biological differences. What has been called the New Racism argues that the dominant cultures is threatened by immigrant cultures, and argues for repatriation of immigrants to their countries of origin – for their own good. These arguments have become a discourse of our time, not only supported by extreme right parties or organisations.

The fight against racism and racial discrimination has in the last decade become an extensive concern for the European Community and its member states. The legal basis to combat discrimination at the national and European level have been considerably strengthened and a line has been drawn which sets the minimum standards and benchmarks the future development on non-discrimination. In 2000 the member states adopted the Racial Equality Directives\(^1\) and the Employment Equality Directive\(^2\).

Overall, the period from the adoption of the Directives in 2000 has resulted in a re-assessment and re-examination by Governments and interest groups of Member States’ legislation and institutional mechanisms to combat discrimination on the grounds of racial or ethnic origin, religion or belief, disability, sexual orientation and age. In addition, some Member States plan to strengthen the Gender Equality Directive\(^3\) in employment, which brings gender equality legislation in conformity with the latest legislative developments on equal treatment, as part of an overall package of equal treatment legislation.

The establishing of a European Monitoring centre on racism and xenophobia (EUMC) in June 1997\(^4\), during the European Year against Racism, is another significant initiative proving the ambitions of the European Union. The EC Regulation sets out the prime objective for the EUMC, which in short is to “Provide the Community and its Member States with objective, reliable and comparable data at the European Level on the phenomena of racism, xenophobia and anti-Semitism”. The EUMC is also required to: “Study the extent and development of the phenomena and manifestations of racism, xenophobia and anti-Semitism, analyze their causes, consequences and effects, and examine examples of good practice in dealing with them.” The EUMC uses the EC equal treatment directives and the ICERD definition of racial discrimination that has been ratified by the EU Member States\(^5\) to study racism. And accordingly it is not only overt racist violence that should be called racism, but also the subtle expressions of exclusions on grounds of race, ethnicity, religion and culture. Direct expressions of racism as well as indirect expressions, like marginalisations, invisibility making, unfounded accusations, declarations of incapacity, are views as racist since these actions are racist in their consequences.

In order to collect data, the EUMC has established the RAXEN network, which consists of 15 co-partners or National Focal Points, one in each Member State. With the assistance of the RAXEN network the EUMC has achieved an overview of the organisations and institutions working in the

---


\(^4\) European Council adopted the Regulation EC No 1035/97

\(^5\) “any distinction, exclusion, restriction or preference based on “race”, colour, descent, or national or ethnic origin which has the purpose or effect of nullifying or impairing the recognition, enjoyment or exercise, on an equal footing, of human rights and fundamental freedoms in the political, economic, social, cultural or any other field of public life”.
member states with the issues, and accordingly an overview of what kind of activities and data that exist and what kind of data that do not exist.

It has become obvious that there is a general lack of data related to racism and xenophobia and even more so when it comes to data that are comparable within the 15 EU member states. This means that for the EUMC to monitor racism effectively a lot of tools are still to be developed by the Member States. For improving the situation with regard to comparability, objectivity and reliability of data at Community level the EUMC has initiated surveys, preparatory studies and feasibility studies.

In 2001 the EUMC initiated a research project called Migrants’ experiences of racism and discrimination. The aim of the project is to develop comparable data on migrant and minority groups with regard to experiences of racism and discrimination in their everyday life, by using as far as possible a similar methodology for data collection and data analysis. The comparability approach was at the same time an investigation into the conditions for conducting comparable quantitative research on migrants and minorities in various EU member states. The project reflects the colonial past as well as the new economic and political situation in world. Migrants from Morocco, Turkey, and Yugoslavia have become especially numerous in Western Europe over the last decades, which is notable in this project. With the continuation of the project and the full coverage of the 15 EU member states, migrants of third country nationals settled in Europe will leave their traits in the map of groups vulnerable to racism and discrimination.

As surveys on experienced discrimination among migrants have been conducted in Sweden6 and Finland7 over the last decade, and as researchers in these two countries already have an established cooperation, which recently has influenced a similar survey in Denmark8, it was decided to investigate the possibility of using the Nordic surveys as a model for the rest of the countries in the European Union. Professor Anders Lange at Stockholm University and the designer of the Swedish survey allowed the EUMC to use the already developed methodological approach and instrument in the other eleven member states. The EUMC started the project in 2001 with a survey in Italy9 and the Netherlands10, continuing in 2002 with surveys in Belgium11, Spain12, Austria13 and the United Kingdom14. For 2003 another three countries will be selected and the project will end by 2004 with the commission of the remaining member states of the EU and with a comparative analysis. In the following I will discuss the Dutch, the Italian and the Spanish studies in relation to the Swedish with regard to methods and with regards to findings.

2. The Model study

In Sweden the Ombudsman against ethnic discrimination initiated a series of surveys measuring the experiences of discrimination by selected immigrant groups, starting in 1990s. The choice of groups was related to those who often had turned to the Ombudsman’s office with complaints. In the survey from 1995, which was used as the model, the respondents were selected under four categories: “Africans” (mainly from Ethiopia, Somalia, Uganda), “Arabs” (mainly from Lebanon, Syria and Iraque), “Asians” (mainly from China, Thailand, Vietnam) and “Ex-Yugoslavians”. The sampling

---

6 A. Lange,(1997) Immigrants on Discrimination II, CEIFO, University of Stockholm
7 K. Liebkind, Dr I Jasinskaja-Lahti, Maahanmuuttajien sopeutuminen paakaupunkiseudulla, Ministry of Labour: Helsinki
frame was defined after criteria such as age (18-60 years old) and time of arrival (1971-1991). The study was thereby restricted to the first generation immigrants. The Swedish Central Bureau of Statistics carried out a sample based on a combination of independent random sample and stratified samples. Stratification by sex was necessary because of the strongly skewed sex distribution in the respective populations. The total sample was 1,600, 400 per category. The total response rates exceeding 60% with small differences between the migrant categories and small differences between men and women.

The questionnaire had already been used in the first survey and thereby been evaluated, a few questions had been exchanged. Questionnaires were sent to respondents in Swedish and in mother tongue language (English, Amarinya, Arabic, Chinese, Thai, Vietnamese or Serbo-Croatian). The questionnaires were attached to a covering letter containing a detailed description of the confidentiality rules for the survey and brief instructions on how to answer the questions.

The data collection lasted from mid September till mid December in 1995. Questionnaires were mailed in September and a first reminder was sent out in October. Respondents who had not returned a completed questionnaire after the first reminder were contacted in a telephone follow-up. If the respondent agreed an interview was conducted on the telephone in Swedish. A second letter of reminder was sent out in November and the data collection was ended in December.

3. Methodological divergences from the Model study

**Sample frames and samples**

When comparing the EUMC initiated surveys with the Swedish model study, there are two major conditional differences to take into account. The first is related to the financial conditions. The EUMC project did not have the same kind of budget for the individual surveys as the Swedish model study. The EUMC budget did for example not allow for purchase of samples or for telephone interviews to increase the response rates, as was done in the Swedish survey. The second conditional divergence is related to the restricted time for conducting the EUMC studies. In all the EUMC studies were limited to a period of seven months including data collection and data analysis and had to start rather immediately after contracts were signed. This meant for instance that it was not enough time, in the Dutch case, to request a national random sample, as this would have taken too long time. The shortage of time had of course also an impact on the data collection period, which was evidently shorter than in the Swedish case.

National population statistics providing information about the population’s citizenship, nationality, or country of birth (also if asylum seekers and refugees) do not exist in all EU member states. In some countries, such as Sweden, national statistics also record immigration status, such as first and second generation\(^{15}\) and if naturalised\(^{16}\), and by various socio-economic variables including geographical site. However, it is not always the case that a random sample of selected immigrants groups by nationality or country of birth, by sex and age group, can be ordered and purchased. In the EUMC project so far, national population statistics in Belgium, Italy and in the Netherlands keep records of country of birth/origin and provide sample service for scientific purposes. However, it might take time for negotiations with the authorities, and in order to save time, the Dutch\(^{17}\) and the Italian studies, also the Belgian, are based on sample frames and samples from selected municipalities instead of national samples. And further on samples from municipalities where samples could be purchased to a low cost.

---

\(^{15}\) The second-generation immigrants are born in Sweden, and found in statistics by the parents’ nationality or country of birth. In the Netherlands immigrants are recorded as allochthonous, meaning either that the person or at least one of the parents is born abroad.

\(^{16}\) Naturalised is a person that has received a citizenship of the new country.

\(^{17}\) The Municipalities’ Basic Registration (GBA) is the only Dutch authority that can provide required data on migrants including addresses, which the National Statistics Office cannot.
In some of the EU member states national population statistics do not keep information about country of birth, nationality or ethnicity. In France for instance it is prohibited according to the Constitution. For three countries in the EUMC project so far, Austria, Spain and the United Kingdom, the sampling could not follow the model study and alternative ways had to be found. Census data have been helpful as reference for stratification of samples in Austria and in the United Kingdom, but not in Spain, where census data do not exist. In Spain the research team developed stratified samples by a quota system, based on the official statistics from ministries of Interior and Labor regarding legal residents and registered workers. The quotas reflect the official proportion of migrant/minority groups with regard to sex, residential region, and registration of employment.

The samples in the Swedish study combine random samples and structured samples. A number of considerations lay behind the choice of migrant groups. One of them referred to the most vulnerable from various continents according to the Ombudsman for Ethnic Discrimination. The size of the groups was another concern. The former Yugoslavians represent not just a numerous immigrant group but also a group of migrants with a shorter geographic, cultural and “phenotypic” distance in relation to immigrants from Africa, Asian and the Middle East, which was a factor of relevance for the study of discrimination.

The fact that the Swedish study, compares the respondents by the size of the location; metropolitan (larger cities) and non-metropolitan areas (smaller cities), the EUMC project strives to make similar comparisons, by constructing the samples by size of location, larger cities and smaller cities, and of course on the fact of high numbers of immigrants. In the Dutch study samples are based on the immigrant population in Rotterdam, the Hague, Arnhem and Tilburg. In the Italian case samples are taken from Turin, Florence, Naples, and Brescia.

In the Dutch and the Italian studies, which most closely follow the Swedish model study, samples have been stratified by sex, age groups and geographical location for each nationality group. Migrant groups from five continents have been selected. In the Dutch study: Surinamese (South America), Moroccans (Africa), Indonesians (Asia), Turks (Middle East) and Ex Yugoslavians (Eastern Europe), representing different ethnic, cultural and religious backgrounds, postcolonial migrants and “guest-workers”. The Dutch study is not restricted to first generation immigrants; also the second generation “allochthonous” is included.

In the Italian study, Africa is represented by migrants Morocco and Senegal, Latin America by migrants from Peru, Asia by Philippines, and Europe by Albanians. Italy (and Spain) is a country where immigration is a new phenomena compared to Sweden and the Netherlands.

The study in Spain is based on a combination of the most numerous immigrant groups and the most vulnerable, namely the Moroccans, the Ecuadorians and the Colombians. In addition the Roma minority is included as identified as the most discriminated ethnic group in Spain. The two Latin American groups are quite new and have increased considerably in the last decade, and are considered living in the most critical phase of migration, with regard to legal insecurity, black economy, etc. In the Spanish study, samples are taken from regions such as Catalonia, Madrid and Andalucia, the three regions where the majority of the immigrants reside. It should be added that the Roma is not only a vulnerable ethnic groups in Spain, but in several EU Member States. However, it is evidently more difficult to establish a sample frame of Roma as they are citizens, proportionally selected for large and smaller cities.

---

Table 1. Samples and respondents divided by origin for Sweden, Netherlands, Italy, and Spain

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study/ Sample/ respondents</th>
<th>Sweden</th>
<th>Netherlands</th>
<th>Italy</th>
<th>Spain</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Turkey and Albania(^{19})</td>
<td>960/149</td>
<td>962/96</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ex-Yugoslavia</td>
<td>400/233</td>
<td>960/190</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morocco(^{20})</td>
<td>960/124</td>
<td>964/54</td>
<td>400/337</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Africa (excl Morroco(^{21}))</td>
<td>400/221</td>
<td>962/73</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle East(^{22})</td>
<td>400/256</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asia(^{23})</td>
<td>400/233</td>
<td>960/190</td>
<td>965/63</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latin America(^{24})</td>
<td>960/149</td>
<td>828/94</td>
<td>400/331(^{25})</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roma(^{26})</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>400/351</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total samples/ Responses (rate%)</td>
<td>1600/955</td>
<td>4807/772</td>
<td>4663/380</td>
<td>1200/1019</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Data collection
The second divergence is related to the methods for data collection. In the model study, questionnaires (in various languages) were sent by post accompanied by introduction letters and pre-paid response envelopes to individuals in the samples. In Sweden a letter of reminder was sent out three weeks later and respondents who had not returned a completed questionnaire after the first letter of reminder were contacted by telephone. In those cases where the respondents agreed to take part in the survey a telephone interview was done in Swedish.

The studies in Italy and the Netherlands followed the Swedish model, and sent out questionnaires by post. A postcard as reminder was sent out a week after the first contact. No telephone interviews were conducted. In the Italian study the addresses were not always the correct, in total 12% of the sent out questionnaires were returned undelivered, which give a signal of high mobility.

In connection with the start of the data collection in the Netherlands, a press release was sent to the editors of the TV news program called Migranten TV, which is broadcasted in the Ranstad area, where many immigrants reside. Other local TV stations with special broadcasts for migrants followed up the press release.

In the Spanish case, questionnaires were handed out by a team of ten persons who located the informants in accordance with the real proportions of migrants, by gender and region. The informants introduced the study. The forms were collected at the time or returned by post.

\(^{19}\) In the Netherlands the samples are exclusively Turks and in Italy Albanians
\(^{20}\) Exclusively from Morocco
\(^{21}\) Mainly Ethiopia and Somalia in the Swedish study, exclusively from Senegal in the Italian study
\(^{22}\) Mainly from Lebanon, Iraq and Syria in the Swedish study (labelled as “Arabic world”)
\(^{23}\) Mainly from Thailand, Vietnam, China in the Swedish study, Philippine (Italian study), Indonesia (Dutch study)
\(^{24}\) Ecuador and Colombia (Spanish study), Peru (Italian study), and Surinam (Dutch study)
\(^{25}\) In the Spanish sample frame 122 were Colombians and 278 were Ecuadorians
\(^{26}\) Roma are mainly Spanish citizens
**Questionnaire**

The third but minor divergence is related to the questionnaire. The Swedish questionnaire was adopted with only some minor changes to fit local differences, to improve usability and improve the validity. In the Dutch study, formulations referring to “foreign background” were changed to “allochthonous background”. In the Italian study a question was added regarding experiences of having been stopped by the police for simple check of documents and another question on eventual reporting of discrimination to the police. In the Spanish study, two questions were added, one on losing a job because of foreign background and the other question on detainment by police. The questionnaire was slightly changed to address the Roma, as they are not immigrants. Some specific questions regarding the social, economic and cultural traditions of the Roma were included and questions on the migratory process excluded.

In the Swedish study questionnaires were distributed in Swedish and in one more language. In the Dutch study questionnaires were translated into Turkish, Moroccan-Arabic and Serbo-Croatian in addition to Dutch. In the Italian study in addition to Italian, the questionnaires were translated and sent out in Albanian, Tagalog, Moroccan-Arabic, Spanish and in French. French questionnaire was sent to the Senegalese. Native speakers did the translation of the questionnaires. In Spain there was only a questionnaire in Spanish, and the functionaries did assist in explaining the questions for the Moroccans, the only non-Spanish speaking group. The questionnaire was tested in Spain and in the Netherlands, not in Italy.

**Response rates**

Table 1 shows the responses per country and per migrant group. The variety is extensive. The average response rate in Italy is only 10%, in the Dutch study, 17% and while it is 84% in the Spanish study and 60% in the Swedish study.

It seems obvious that the response rates are related to the way data are collected and that posted questionnaires might not be a way to collect data among migrants and minorities. In the Spanish study local functionaries handed out questionnaires and assisted with instructions. In the Swedish study telephone interviews were used to increase the response rates. In the Italian and the Dutch cases the only follow up was a post card.

One possible explanation suggested to the low response rates in Italy is the lack of confidence in surveys. And related to this a lower level of integration and a lack of trust in official institutions. Another explanation might be difficulties to understand the questions and how to fill in the form, as many respondents have lower education than average.

In the Netherlands it is quite common with low response rates for surveys in general, not only when migrants are addressed. For migrants, there is a “survey fatigue” and a general mistrust in surveys following large numbers of surveys among migrant population. Regarding the representation of responses in the Dutch study, a weighting system has been applied for gender and age.

As the samples for each migrant group was stratified by gender and age, the proportions of responses could be weighted in order to avoid disproportional analysis of findings.

4. **Experiences of racism and discrimination – findings in comparison**

In spite of the variation with regard to samples, sampling and data collection methods, the results have a lot of correspondence in Sweden, Netherlands, Italy and Spain.
**Significant differences of discriminatory acts**

In all questionnaire there were 17 questions measuring discrimination in various areas\(^{27}\). When comparing the single items measuring discrimination in the four studies and for the various migrant and minority groups the following items had the highest scores per country:

Table 2 Total percentage of perceived discrimination for selected items per country

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country/Act of discrimination(%)</th>
<th>Sweden</th>
<th>Netherlands</th>
<th>Italy</th>
<th>Spain</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Job recruitment</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Insults/harassment In public</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harassment at work</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harassment by neighbours</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denied renting apartment</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- The single discriminatory act that has been reported by a high number of migrants in all the four countries is experiences of insults and harassment at work because of their foreign/ethnic background. In total 40% in both the Italian study and in the Dutch studies and about 30% in both the Spanish and the Swedish studies, have had these experiences during the last years.
- Another discriminatory act that has high scores in all four countries is also related to the employment domain, namely experience of not getting a job qualified for because of the foreign/ethnic background. 40% in both the Spanish and in the Swedish study and about 30% in the Dutch and in the Italian studies report this kind of perceived discrimination.
- A third single act of discrimination that has high scores in the four countries in experiences of insults or harassment in the public transport or in the streets because of the foreign/ethnic background. In total about 30% of the respondents in the Netherlands and in Spain, and even more in Sweden and Italy have experiences this in the last year more than once. In Italy 45% of all respondents have had these kinds of experiences lately.
- The single item that is a larger problem in the two Southern countries than in the Northern countries is discrimination with regard to renting or buying apartments or houses. In the Italian study as well as in the Spanish studies, discrimination with regard to having been denied renting or buying an apartment or a house because of their foreign/ethnic background is the highest of all items. In total 63% of the Italian respondents and 55% of the Spanish respondents report having this experience of discrimination. In Sweden and in the Netherlands it is about 10% of all respondents. And when excluding respondents for who renting or buying was not relevant, the percentage raises to nearly 80%.
- Insult or harassment by neighbours is another item that migrants and minorities encounter, about 30% of the respondents in Spain and in Italy and about 20% of the respondents in Sweden and the Netherlands.
- The category that has the lowest score in all four studies refers to denial of entry into shops because of foreign/ethnic background. The percentage varies from 13% in the Spain to about 3% in the other three countries.

**Significant ethnic differences**

\(^{27}\) In the Dutch study, the factor analysis resulted in a slightly different pattern. Therefore I will only discuss the responses to the single items.
When comparing the perceived discrimination in various domains and for various migrant and minority groups’ experiences of discrimination, there seems to be a rather stable pattern of the most vulnerable groups that come to the shore.

Table 3 The Migrant groups per country and domain of discrimination having significant more experiences of discrimination than other migrant groups in respective country

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country/Domain of discrimination</th>
<th>Sweden</th>
<th>Netherlands</th>
<th>Italy</th>
<th>Spain</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>employment sphere</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yugoslavia and Arabs</td>
<td></td>
<td>Moroccans and Turks</td>
<td>Senegalese and Moroccans</td>
<td>Moroccans</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>public and social sphere</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Africans (Ethiopians)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Turks and Moroccans</td>
<td>Senegalese</td>
<td>Moroccans and Ecuadorians</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>institutional sphere</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No significances</td>
<td></td>
<td>Turks</td>
<td>Senegalese</td>
<td>No significances</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>violence and harassment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Africans (Ethiopians)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Turks and Moroccans</td>
<td>Senegalese</td>
<td>Ecuadorians</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Whereas the migrant groups are very much the same in all areas of discrimination in the Netherlands, Italy and Spain, the migrant groups in the Swedish study vary with the areas.
- The Moroccans and the Ecuadorians in Spain, and the Moroccans and the Turks in the Netherlands, and the Moroccans and the Senegalese in Italy express significantly more often experienced discrimination in the area of employment, in the public/social sphere as well as experienced violence in the streets, in comparison to other migrants groups in their countries.

Significant Gender differences

When comparing the reported experiences of discrimination in the 17 various situations, it is clear the men have in general experienced more discrimination than women. At the same time, the differences between men and women are not always significant higher and there are domains where women have much more experiences of discrimination than men.

- In Spain Roma women have to a significant higher extent experienced being denied entrance to shops than Roma men.
- In the Netherlands Moroccan, Turkish, Yugoslavian and Surinamese women have to a significant higher extent experienced harassment by neighbours than Moroccan, Turkish, Yugoslavian and Surinamese men. Moroccan and Turkish women have also been harassed in the streets significantly more than Moroccan and Turkish men. Another area where women have more experiences of discrimination than men is in contact with health care institutions. Turkish and Yugoslavian women report much more discrimination of this kind than Turkish and Yugoslavian men.

---

28 Have (i) not been offered a job qualified for because of foreign/ethnic background (ii) missed a promotion because of foreign/ethnic background, and (iii) been subjected to insult at work because of foreign/ethnic background during the last 5 years
29 Have been (i) refused entry to restaurant (ii) shop (iii) denied possibility to buy on credit (iv) denied buy/rent house/apartment because of foreign/ethnic background (v) subjected to insult/harassment in school because of foreign/ethnic background during the last 5 years
30 Have been badly treated or received poor service in contacts with (i) the employment service/job centre, (ii) social insurance, (iii) police, (iv) health care service, (v) social service, because of foreign/ethnic background during the last year
31 Have been (i) subjected to insult/harassment by neighbours (ii) in the street/public transport (iii) subjected to violence, robbery or crime because of because of foreign/ethnic background during the last year
• In Sweden the Asian women have to a significant higher degree experiences threats, insults or harassments in the street than Asian men. Asian women have also much more experiences of discriminatory treatment in restaurants and shops than Asian men.

5. Concluding remarks

Reflections on quantitative methods for comparative studies

Hardly anybody would deny that quantified data measuring the social situation for vulnerable groups in society do have a better chance of getting political and media attention and thereby lead to political preventive interventions, than non-quantified data. This is the reason why the EUMC project has chosen to use a quantitative approach. The project gives at the same time an insight into the limits of traditional quantitative research and the use of posted questionnaire for data collection in the EU member states. The most obvious is the extreme high percentages of non-responses following post surveys. There are worrying signs when people do not want to take part of surveys also when they could benefit thereof.

But what is on the other hand an acceptable response rate? In the Swedish model study a response rate of 60% was accepted. But the acceptance was related to the analysis of the non-respondents and to the balance between respondents and non-respondents. When the proportions of men and women in certain age groups are intact, the representation is considered statistically secured. In addition there is always the possibility of statistical weighting of the underrepresented parts and thereby an increase of representation. So after all the high percentage of dropouts must not be the major problem. Both the Dutch and the Italian studies had extreme low response rates 10% (Italian study) and 17% (Dutch study). But as the proportions of responses were intact with the proportions of the sample frames the dropouts did not ruin the representation. In addition the responses were weighted in order to achieve the acceptable proportions.

There might though be other and more serious problems caused by low response rates and that is the kind of answers given. With a small number of responses the risk is higher that the answers are more limited in variety or even unbalanced. Therefore it is to prefer that the samples are huge from the start, as in the Dutch and the Italian case. In the end the Dutch number of responses were about 800, which is not too far from the absolute numbers of filled in questionnaires in the Swedish (60% responses) and in the Spanish study (84% responses).

When post surveys can be combined with telephone interviews or with personal interviews the response rates obviously increases. Whether this mixture of data collection methods has an impact on the way individuals’ answer the questionnaire has to be further analysed. The same goes for the method of handing out questionnaires. The response rates are extremely high, as been shown in the Spanish study. But whether the method has an impact on the how individual’s answer must be studied. The handing out of questionnaires is however a solution in the case where no addresses from random samples can be achieved. The shortcomings of handing out questionnaires instead of sending by post are obvious. You have to restrict the study to a more limited geographical area or you have to rely on a numbers of local assistants.

Ethnicity, gender and discrimination

Interestingly enough the results of the various surveys are not so divergent as might have been expected with the totally different methods. The extent of experienced discrimination is higher for job recruitment and for insults and harassment at workplaces and in the public. Migrant groups from in particular Africa have reported more experiences of discrimination than for instance migrants from Europe or from Asia. Men have in comparison to women reported more perceived discrimination than women. However there are gender differences with regard to various spheres. The findings raise the expectations for the extension to all the 15 EU Member States.
Gender does not explain so much of the variance as could have been expected.

At the same time there are indications of significant gender differences.

The new anti-discrimination legislation when implemented will urge the EU member states to install institutions to record complaints on discrimination on racial/ethnical, religious, grounds and support victims in courts. At the same time there is a lot of work ahead to encourage and convince individuals to turn to institutions and report on discrimination and ill treatment. The Swedish Ombudsman against Ethnic Discrimination found it necessary to measure the extent of perceived discrimination by surveys also when the Ombudsman institution had existed for many years. It is therefore expected that the EUMC project will be an ongoing project for many years to come. After all there is no other and more reliable way to find out about the level and the kind of discrimination than to ask vulnerable groups and potential victims.

### Employment
1. Did not get job
2. Missed promotion
3. Insulted/harassed at work

### Violence
1. Insulted/harassed by neighbours
2. Insulted/harassed in street
3. Subjected to violence/robbery

### Public and social
1. Denied house/apartment
2. Badly treated in school
3. Refused entry in restaurants/bars
4. Refused entry in shops
5. Denied credit

### Institutions
1. Badly treated in restaurants/bars
2. Badly treated by job agency
3. Badly treated by social insurance
4. Badly treated by police
5. Badly treated by health service
6. Badly treated by social service